



### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                       | "LING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/204,971  | 12/03/1998    | DAVID LARS EHNEBUSKE | AT9-98-267              | 9311             |
| 759   | 90 02/12/2002 |                      |                         |                  |
| DUKE W YEE EXAMINE                                    |               |                      | INER                    |                  |
| CARSTENS YEE & 4 AHOON P O BOX 802334 DALLAS, TX 7538 |               |                      | INGBERG, TODD D         |                  |
|   |               |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |               |                      | 2122                    | · .              |
|   |               |                      | DATE MAILED: 02/12/2002 |                  |

Please find below and/c1 attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 501 | ′ ننا |
|-----|-------|
|     |       |

## \_\_\_

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/204,971

Applicanties

David Lars Ehnebuske et al.

Examiner

**Todd Ingberg** 

Group Art Unit 2122



| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  |
|---|
| (1) Todd Ingberg (3)  |
| (2) Steve Walder (4)  |
| Date of Interview Feb 8, 2002   |
| Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]   |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:   |
| Claim(s) discussed:   |
| Identification of prior art discussed:  |
|   |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) $oxtimes$ was reached. g) $oxtimes$ was not reached. h) $oxtimes$ N/A.  |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  |
| See Attachment.   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
|   |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)   |
| i) 🛛 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  |
| Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST NCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached |
| 1 has   |

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-413 (Rev. 03-98)

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summers

Part of Paper No. 13



# Interview Summary 09/204,971

The following two issues were discussed

- The Examiner choice of words "Finding of Fact"
- The Flowmark<sup>™</sup> product

### "Finding of Fact"

Applicant's Representative was concerned over the phrase "Finding of Fact" used by the Examiner. The Examiner explained the intent was that the Examiner based on Applicant's response to the Office action, the Examiner has an understanding of the terms and not that there is closure on the issue regarding terms. The Examiner found the Applicant's response to the issue of terms to be excellent and stated this during the interview. Furthermore, the Applicant has every right to dispute and/or clarify any term.

#### Flowmark<sup>TM</sup>

The Examiner statements directed to the Flowmark<sup>TM</sup> product was discussed. The Examiner had searched for information on the product and placed it on a PTO-892 as requested by Applicant. Examiner does not have any reason to believe the invention and the Flowmark<sup>TM</sup> product are related.

This should clarify the Examiner's position on these two issues.

